

REMARKS

The Office Action of May 27, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 12 have been amended. Claims 5, 10, and 11 have been cancelled. New claims 13-17 have been added. The independent claims are: claims 1, 6, 7, and 12.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 12-17 are now pending in the Application and are submitted to be in allowable condition.

Part a. of paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejects claim 1 as being anticipated by *Haitz* (US 5,917,202). Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature that the "*rear surface electrode in ohmic contact with a first region of the back surface of the electrically conductive substrate opposite from the semiconductor light emitting portion and having a **honeycomb pattern which is continuously distributed** on the entire back surface of the substrate*". Part 5 of the Office Action alleges that *Takeuchi* (US 2003/0052323) teaches the same hexagonal honeycomb pattern as claimed in the present disclosure, however, the dispersed electrodes 7 shown in Fig. 2 of *Takeuchi* are applied to an electrode located on the side from which light is extracted, that is, the upper surface, instead a rear surface electrode. Paragraphs [0051] and [0052] of *Takeuchi* describe the dispersed electrodes 7 that are applied to part of the surface of the semiconductor layer 3 and transparent conductive film 4 which covers both the dispersed electrodes 7 and the semiconductor layer 3. It can be inferred from the cross

sectional diagram and the citation of the reference above that the present invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6, 7, and 12 are patentably distinguishable from, and are not suggested by the combination of cited references.

Since claim 2 depends from the currently amended independent claim 1 it is respectfully requested that the rejection in part b. of paragraph 2 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

With respect to section 4 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 4 depend from currently amended claim 1, and as *Haitz* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Slater* and *Liu* in relation to claim 1, claim 3 and 4 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The rejection of claim 5 with respect to claim 5, in paragraph 5 of the Office Action has been rendered moot as claim 5 has been cancelled. Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form to distinguish the claimed invention over the *Takeuchi* reference. Thus, the rejections of section 5 of the Office Action are respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claims 7-12 in part 6 of the Office Action relies on the teachings of *Takeuchi* which have been discussed above. Independent claims 7 and 12 have been amended to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied combination of references cited. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these rejected claims are now in allowable form.

The newly added claims depend from the independent claims discussed above and recite additional limitations to further define the invention. They are therefore automatically patentable along with their independent claims and need not be further discussed.


It is noted that this Amendment increases the total number of independent claims pending in the application to a total of four (4), thus requiring an excess claim fee of \$250.00 for one independent claim in excess of three (3). A check in this amount is attached. Should additional fees be required, or should the check be inadvertently missing, please charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise the undersigned counsel accordingly.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Date: August 27, 2008

ALP/klc

Respectfully submitted,



Alun L. Palmer

(Registration No. 47,838)

Customer number 23995

Telephone: (202) 371-8976

Facsimile: (202) 408-0924